



September 15, 2010

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: TV White Spaces
ET Docket Nos. 04-186 and 02-380

Dear Ms. Dortch:

My company, OACYS Technology, provides fixed wireless broadband service in the California Central Valley and the surrounding hills. We rely primarily on unlicensed spectrum to deliver broadband services to consumers that have very limited broadband choices. We built our network from scratch using devices authorized under Part 15 rules the FCC adopted to open up 900 MHz, 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz spectrum for unlicensed broadband devices. Thanks to the Commission's initiatives, consumers in this area can now get broadband service. We have also recently started using the 3.65GHz band to deploy service, but considering the reduced channel bandwidth we can only deploy a few transmitters in a large area.

OACYS is very interested in utilizing television white spaces so that we can expand service offerings. The current unlicensed ISM bands are very congested due to all the consumer devices that are in use, we typically have trouble finding a usable channel when placing a new transmitter. Using TV white spaces would also give us more non-LOS opportunities to reach users that may have no other options. We are committed to deploying as soon as equipment for point-to-multipoint service is commercially available to utilize the TV white spaces.

I am pleased that the FCC will be acting on TV white space petitions for reconsideration in the near future. There are several proposals that would help us to deploy service:

First, the FCC should allow WISPs to operate using base station antennas mounted higher than 30 meters, and we should be allowed to install customer antennas (CPE) at heights below 10 meters. If we could increase our base station antenna height to 100 meters, we could cover three times more area with a base station and reduce our equipment, tower acquisition and tower lease fees by a large amount – an amount that could be the difference between deploying and not deploying in an area. We support the WISPA and Motorola proposals to increase base station height. By removing any minimum CPE height restrictions, we would not have to put tall masts on residences and we would be able to provide service at a lower cost.

Second, we believe we should be allowed to operate with power in excess of 4 Watts EIRP in rural areas. As is the case with tower height, operating with higher power will give us a greater coverage area and we will not need to spend as much money on infrastructure.



Third, we are very concerned about a proposal made by FiberTower and others to license white space spectrum for point-to-point wireless backhaul. Not only would adopting this proposal take six channels (36 MHz) and perhaps more channels away from us, but WISPs also would have to protect these licensed links. Moreover, channels and areas far beyond the links would be blocked because the signals from the licensed links would overshoot the path and the endpoints. This is due to the low-cost, low-gain antennas FiberTower wants to use. We also would not deploy if a licensed point-to-point user could come along later and put us out of business with a licensed link. We support the views expressed by WISPA in their September 8 letter and ask the FCC to reject the FiberTower proposal.

We are enthusiastic about what opportunities could be available for using parts of the TV white space to deploy broadband in our area. We believe this band could help us add new coverage as well as expand the service offerings to our existing customers.

Sincerely,

Ryan Walker
Senior Network Engineer